



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—*The Lenaea, the Anthesteria, and the Temple ἐν Λίμναις.*

BY DR. WILLIAM NICKERSON BATES,  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

SINCE Dörpfeld's discovery in 1894 of the small Dionysus temple lying to the west of the Acropolis and south of the Areopagus, there has been much speculation as to the identity of the building and its connection with the worship of Dionysus at Athens. Dörpfeld thinks he has found the famous temple *ἐν Λίμναις* and has published his reasons for thinking so in a long article in the *Mittheil. d. k. d. arch. Inst. in Athen* for 1895. In advocating this theory Dörpfeld is quite consistent with his earlier views held before the temple was discovered, that the *λίμναι* lay to the northwest of the Acropolis. In this he was supported by Pickard in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for 1893 and by others. The most recent contribution to the literature of the subject is a paper by von Prott in the *Mittheil. d. k. d. arch. Inst. in Athen* for 1898 discussing the question at length and agreeing with Dörpfeld in his main contention, that the temple really is the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*. As I cannot agree with this conclusion after a careful examination of the evidence, it seems worth while to point out what appear to me to be the weak points in the theory and to discuss in connection with it the evidence for the Lenaea and the Anthesteria, the festivals with which it is involved.

Thucydides, in the much discussed passage in the second book (II. 15), in commenting on Athens in the olden time gives as a proof that the city in so far as it was outside of the Acropolis lay chiefly to the south of it, the fact that some of the oldest sanctuaries lay in that direction and names the temple of Olympian Zeus, the Pythium, the temple of Ge and that of Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις*, where, he says, *ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια ποιεῖται ἐν μηνὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνι*. In other words, Thucydides

says that certain Dionysus rites which he characterizes as *ἀρχαιότερα* were celebrated at the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* which lay south of the Acropolis. This passage has been so much discussed and so many attempts have been made to change or emend it that it is hardly necessary to quote it in full here. Dörpfeld has argued at great length to show that there is nothing in the passage contrary to his view that the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* lay to the west of the Acropolis. His arguments were vigorously attacked by Stahl in an article in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1895, to which he made reply in the same periodical for the year following. After all the discussion it seems impossible to me that the passage *τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἡ νῦν οὐσα πόλις ἦν καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμένον. τεκμήριον δέ· τὰ γὰρ ἵερα ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκρόπολει καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἔστι καὶ τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἔδρυται, τό τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τὸ Πύθιον καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου* can mean anything else than that the sanctuaries enumerated lay to the south of the Acropolis. Certainly the burden of proof lies with those who would have it mean otherwise, and their arguments so far are unconvincing.

Dörpfeld also argues that there is evidence that three of the temples named were on the northwest slope of the Acropolis and that the fourth would naturally be there too. But this conclusion is open to objection. For if we grant that there were three sanctuaries situated in this vicinity bearing the names mentioned by Thucydides, it would by no means follow that those were the ones he had in mind, since we also have evidence for buildings bearing the same names south of the Acropolis.

In regard to the Pythium there is sufficient evidence for a sanctuary of this name on the northwest slope of the Acropolis; but there is also evidence for a second Pythium near the Ilissus and a third near the market-place as Dörpfeld frankly admits. With the Olympium the case is not quite the same. The chief piece of evidence for the existence of such a shrine northwest of the Acropolis is a passage in Strabo (IX. 404) where we are told that the Athenians

watched the Harma for the lightning ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσχάρας τοῦ ἀστραπαίου Διὸς which is ἐν τῷ τείχει μεταξὺ τοῦ Πυθίου καὶ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου. If this Pythium is the one on the northwest slope of the Acropolis, the Olympium mentioned would naturally be somewhere near it. This is probable but not certain. But southeast of the Acropolis there was another Olympium of which remains still exist, the great temple of Olympian Zeus. The fact that this building was not finished until the reign of Hadrian is not a proof that Thucydides is not referring to it. The temple had been begun on a magnificent scale by Pisistratus a century before his time, and the fact that it was completed so many years afterwards on the same spot shows that the enclosure must have remained sacred ground during the interval. Thucydides could thus very properly refer to it, especially when it is remembered that there were certain ancient shrines inside the enclosure and that certain very ancient rites were performed there throughout the classical period, and furthermore that Pausanias implies that there was situated the very early temple of Olympian Zeus, which popular report in his day attributed to Deucalion (Paus. I. 18, 7-8).

In regard to the sanctuary of Ge not very much can be said on either side. Pausanias, I. 22, 3, speaks of a shrine of Ge Kourotophos and Demeter Chloe which lay to the west of the Acropolis; but in I. 18, 7 he mentions a temenos of Ge Olympia within the peribolos of the great Olympium, that is, southeast of the Acropolis. The evidence for one is about as strong as it is for the other. It seems clear, therefore, that even if we should set the Thucydides passage aside we should be no better off as regards the location of the sanctuaries he mentions. We have shrines of the same name in both quarters of the city. When therefore he tells us that he means those lying to the south of the Acropolis, I think we are forced to accept his statement.

Postponing for a time the further discussion of the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*, I propose to examine the evidence for the festivals of the Lenaean and the Anthesteria, which, I think, will throw some light on the subject.

Thucydides, in the passage which has been quoted, tells us that the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια were celebrated at the temple ἐν Λίμναις in the month of Anthesterion. This statement is at first sight perplexing. The comparative ἀρχαιότερα would naturally imply that there were but two festivals, an older festival as contrasted with a more recent one. If the more recent festival was the Great Dionysia, which is known to be the latest of the Dionysus festivals at Athens, the one to be contrasted with it would naturally be the Lenaean, the other festival where plays were produced. But from the lexicographers and other sources we hear of two other Dionysus festivals, the Anthesteria and the festival κατ' ἄγρους. This at once constitutes a difficulty which Dörpfeld<sup>1</sup> escapes by making the Lenaean, the Anthesteria, and the Rustic Dionysia a single festival, in opposition to the traditional view of four festivals held since the days of Boeckh. He believes then that in early times, at any rate, there were but two Dionysus festivals, the Great Dionysia and the Lenaean, and the latter he thinks was celebrated at the temple ἐν Λίμναις. This, if right, would certainly explain the comparative, but there is much to be said in opposition to it. This much, however, can be gathered from Thucydides without dispute: that a Dionysus festival, which was an old one, was celebrated at the temple ἐν Λίμναις in the month of Anthesterion.

In the pseudo-Demosthenic speech against Neaera, probably to be attributed to Apollodorus, the speaker in mentioning certain duties of the wife of the King Archon says (§§ 100–101), that “they wrote the law on a stone slab and stood it up by the altar in the temple of Dionysus in the Marshes,” which, later on, he calls the “oldest and most holy” temple of Dionysus, and says that it was opened only once in the year, namely, on the twelfth of the month of Anthesterion. This is perfectly clear, and confirms the passage in Thucydides just discussed. The name of the festival, as we learn from Apollodorus quoted by Suidas, and elsewhere, was the Anthesteria, and in connection with it were celebrated the

<sup>1</sup> *Das Gr. Theater*, p. 9.

**Χόες** or Feast of Pitchers,<sup>1</sup> and the **Χύτροι** or Festival of the Pots.<sup>2</sup> We know then the time of the Anthesteria, the place where it was celebrated, and something of the manner in which it was celebrated.

If now we examine the evidence for the Lenaea, we shall find that it is conflicting. Some authorities tell us that it was celebrated at the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*, while others say at a place called the Lenaum. To be more precise, (1) Hesychius under *Λίμναι* says that this was a place where the Lenaea were held; but in another place (*s.v. Δήναιον*) he says that the Lenaum was the place where the contests were held, and that there was a temple there of Dionysus Lenaeus, that is, Dionysus of the Wine-press. The first of these passages, however, is not as sound a piece of evidence as it might seem at first sight, for von Prott has pointed out that the manuscripts of Hesychius have *λαῖα*, not *Δήναια*, and we cannot be sure that *Δήναια* is the proper restoration. (2) Then the scholiast to Aristophanes, *Acharnians* (960), speaks of the **Χύτροι** as a festival of Dionysus Lenaeus, whereas in the *Frogs* (215) Aristophanes himself connects it with Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις*. (3) Finally Suidas, *s.v. χόες*, although he tells us that this festival was part of the Anthesteria and celebrated on the twelfth of Anthesterion, in another place calls it a festival of Dionysus Lenaeus. His words are: *ὅτι Ὁρέστης μετὰ τὸν φόνον εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικόμενος (ἢν δὲ ἑορτὴ Διονύσου Δηναίου), ὡς μὴ γένοιτο σφίσιν ὁμόσπονδος ἀπεκτονώς τὴν μητέρα, ἐμηχανήσατο τοιόνδε τι. χοῦ οἴνου τῶν δαιτυμόνων ἐκάστῳ παραστῆσας, ἐξ αὐτοῦ πίνειν ἐκέλευσε μηδὲν ὑπομιγνύντας ἀλλήλοις, ὡς μήτε ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κρατήρος πίοι Ὁρέστη, μήτε ἐκεῖνος ἄχθοιτο καθ' αὐτὸν πίνων μόνος κ.τ.λ.* The weakness of this as a piece of evidence for connecting the Lenaea and the Anthesteria is apparent if one looks back two paragraphs where the following words occur: *ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησι χόες ἀπὸ τοιαύτης αἰτίας. Ὁρέστης μετὰ τὴν τῆς μητρὸς ἀναίρεσιν ἥλθεν εἰς Ἀθήνας παρὰ Πανδίονα συγγενῆ καθεστηκότα, δις ἔτυχε βασιλεύων τῶν Ἀθηναίων. κατέλαβε*

<sup>1</sup> Suid. *s.v. χόες*; Athen., p. 437 b-d; 465 a.

<sup>2</sup> Arist. *Frogs*, 215, etc.

δὲ αὐτὸν εὐωχίαν τινὰ δημοτελῆ ποιοῦντα. ὁ τοίνυν Πανδίων παραπέμψασθαι μὲν τὸν Ὁρέστην αἰδούμενος, κοινωνῆσαι δὲ πότου καὶ τραπέζης ἀσεβὲς ἥγονύμενος μὴ καθαρθέντος αὐτοῦ τὸν φόνον, ὡς ἀν μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κρατήρος πίνοι, ἔνα ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεκλημένων παρέθηκε χῶρ. In this version of the story, which seems to have a common origin with the previous one, there is no mention whatsoever of Dionysus Lenaeus. In the first version, which is evidently defective, the words in parenthesis are plainly a gloss, and as such count for little.

But there is further evidence. We hear repeatedly of the festival ἐπὶ Ληναίω which is contrasted with the festival in the city, that is, with the Great Dionysia. This ἄγων ἐπὶ Ληναίω is the festival otherwise known as the Lenaea. Let us now examine the evidence for locating this Lenaeum. Hesychius (*s. v. Λήναιον*) says: "There is in the city the Lenaeum, which has a large enclosure, and in it a temple of Dionysus Lenaeus. In this enclosure the contests (that is, dramatic contests) of the Athenians took place before the theatre was built." This statement, with slight variations, appears in Photius, in the *Etymologicum Magnum* and in an anonymous writer published by Bekker. According to this the Lenaeum was in the city. Photius in another passage (*s. v. Ἰκρία*) says that the Ἰκρία were at the market-place and that from them the people beheld the Dionysiac spectacles before the theatre was built. This is practically repeated by the lexicographer Pausanias. From these two passages we should infer that the Lenaeum was near the market-place. There are, however, two scholia to the *Acharnians* (202 and 504) which put it in the fields. But Demosthenes in scoring the family of Aeschines alludes to the shrine of the hero Calamites, which, from the text, we infer was in a populous part of the city, and from Hesychius we learn that this shrine was near the Lenaeum. So, in spite of the two scholia, we should be justified in putting the Lenaeum in the city near the market-place. This agrees so well with the situation of the temple which Dörpfeld has found that the identification may be safely accepted. For if other evidence on this point were lacking, the finding of a stone wine-press or *ληνός* within

the enclosure and of other smaller ones outside of it would be sufficient to prove what the building was.

We have seen that the evidence for the place where the Lenaea were celebrated is conflicting. Part of it is in favor of the Lenaeum, the situation of which we know, and part of it is in favor of the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*. The latter, as has been shown, is not a strong body of evidence, as it consists only of a gloss in Suidas, of a scholium to a passage in Aristophanes, and a defective passage in Hesychius. For the situation of the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* we have the passage in Thucydides already quoted, and a piece of evidence of this kind given intentionally by a writer of the fifth century could not easily be set aside even if we had other evidence in opposition to it. But such is not the case. We have no other passage definitely stating the position of the sanctuary. In addition to being south of the Acropolis, the peculiar name of the temple also shows that it was situated at least in low ground, and this is confirmed by a reference in the *Frogs* (215), to the croaking of frogs being heard at the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*. The assumption, then, that the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* and the Lenaeum were one and the same, for which Wilamowitz argued in a footnote to his article on the Stage of Aeschylus,<sup>1</sup> will therefore not hold. They are two different sanctuaries located in different parts of the city.

It has already been shown that the Anthesteria were celebrated in the month of Anthesterion. The Lenaea were celebrated in the month of Gamelion as A. Mommsen has proved beyond a doubt in his *Feste der Stadt Athen in Altertum* (p. 373). This is just what would be expected. The month Gamelion corresponded to the Ionic month Lenaean, and there is some ground for believing that even in Athens in early times Gamelion went by this name.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the name Lenaean was still in use in the fourth century in

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes*, 1886, p. 617, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> A. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 373, doubts whether Gamelion ever actually went by the name of Lenaean in Athens, although he admits that Lenaean represented Gamelion in Ionic cities.

the calendars of Myconos,<sup>1</sup> Delos,<sup>2</sup> and other places as several inscriptions testify. The Lenaea then would naturally be the festival of the month of Lenaeon, just as we have seen the Anthesteria was the festival of Anthesterion, and in fact we have this so stated in a scholium quoted by Mommsen.<sup>3</sup> These then were two distinct festivals celebrated at different places and in different months and cannot be regarded as one and the same. This might perhaps be inferred from the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes where we have the Rural Dionysia, the Lenaea and the Anthesteria alluded to in this order as the play progresses.

Since, then, the Lenaea and the Anthesteria were separate festivals, the statement of the pseudo-Demosthenes in the speech against Neaera that the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* was opened on only one day in the year becomes another argument against identifying the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* and the Lenaeum. For we can hardly imagine a festival like the Lenaea celebrated in a precinct where the temple was closed.

The question now confronts us as to how we are to explain the comparative *ἀρχαιότερα* in the passage in Thucydides. Mommsen thinks that the comparative proves that the Lenaea were not known as Dionysia in the time of Thucydides. This is ingenious if not quite convincing. It is perhaps more likely that Thucydides is speaking loosely and uses *τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια* where he means *τὰ Διονύσια τοῦ ἀρχαιοτέρου χρόνου*. Thucydides is constantly contrasting the things of former times with those of later days. The use of the comparative would then mean that the Anthesteria, the festival of early times, was contrasted with the festivals of more recent foundation.

As to the position of the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*, it must satisfy two conditions. It must be south of the Acropolis and in low ground, and so cannot be the temple found by Dörpfeld. That is the Lenaeum, which has been shown to be a different building. It cannot be either of the Dionysus temples lying

<sup>1</sup> Dittenberger, *Syl.* 373, 16 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Bul. de Cor. Hel.* 1881, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Schol. to Aeschin.* I. 43, p. 16: *τὰ δὲ Λήναια μηρὸς Δημαιῶνος.*

near the theatre. One of these is excluded by its age, for it is not older than the fifth century, and the other by a variety of reasons. (1) It is not in or near marshy ground. (2) We know from Pausanias (I. 20, 3) that this was the temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus. (3) The temple *ἐν Λίμναις* was open on only one day in the year, the twelfth of Anthesterion, whereas this temple must have been open at the time of the Great Dionysia in Elaphebolion and on the days when, as Pausanias (I. 29, 2) tells us, its statue was carried in procession. (4) Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις* was connected with the celebration of the Anthesteria, while Dionysus Eleuthereus was connected with the Great Dionysia. This therefore cannot be the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*. As this is the case, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* has not yet been found.

The argument has been advanced by those who follow Dörpfeld's theory, that there is no place which can be called *λίμναι* south of the Acropolis, and that therefore we should not look for the temple in that direction. But it is equally true that there is no such place west of the Acropolis. It is argued that here in early times was a great water-distributing place, and that that will account for the name. It should be pointed out, however, first, that a place for distributing water is not a marsh; and second, that the region lying between the Acropolis and the Pnyx was a small one and very thickly populated in antiquity, as the German excavations have proved. Through this district passed the main road leading up from the market-place to the Acropolis, lined with houses on each side. Surely such a district could not appropriately be designated by the word *λίμναι*. Where then was the temple *ἐν Λίμναις*? A passage in Isaeus (VIII. 35) says that it was in the city, but Wilamowitz has argued plausibly that it was beyond the walls. Whether it was within or without the walls, however, we cannot set the passage in Thucydides aside, but must look for the temple south of the Acropolis, between the modern highway and the Ilissus. The absence of a marsh in that region to-day proves nothing, since the whole surface of the region has no doubt been greatly changed.

by earthquakes. Only extensive excavation can give us any light on its condition in ancient times.

The result of this inquiry then is this. The Lenaea and the Anthesteria were separate festivals celebrated in different months; the former at the Lenaeum, which Dörpfeld has found west of the Acropolis, the latter at the temple *ἐν Λιμναῖς*, which has not yet been discovered.